

REMARKS

This is in response to the Office Action mailed on May 16, 2007. Claims 1-17, 20-22 and 32-33 were pending in the application, and the Examiner rejected all claims. With this amendment, claim 1 is amended and the remaining claims are unchanged in the application.

At the bottom of page 2 of the Office Action, and the top of page 3, the Examiner objected to claim 1 indicating the word "ruler" should be "rule". Applicant has amended the claim as suggested by the Examiner. In the remainder of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected all pending claims either under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) or under 35 U.S.C. §103 in view of the Loatman et al. US Patent No. 4,914,590. Applicant respectfully traverses the Examiner's rejection.

Features of the present claims have been set out in prior responses. Basically, however, the present claims allow a user to review a parse tree that was generated for a textual input. The user can select a connecting point in the parse tree, wherein the selected connecting point has a rule applied to form a constituent that represents at least two children joined together. The system then displays a plurality of alternate rules that can be applied at the selected connecting point to generate a constituent, but the alternate rules are rules other than the rule that actually was applied at the selected connecting point. This allows a user to easily debug a parse, without having to manually recall alternate rules that could be applied under the circumstances at the selected connecting point.

After making a detailed review of the Office Action, it is now clear that the only portion of Loatman et al. that the Examiner is pointing to in order to meet the limitation of displaying alternate rules is the Table in Fig. 9B labeled "FO933 Variables", and the accompanying text at column 37, lines 7-25. For example, the Examiner relies on this at page 4 of the Office Action with respect to claim 1, page 5 of the Office Action, again with respect to claim 1, page 8 of the Office Action with respect to claim 10, and page 10 of the Office Action with respect to claims 17, 20-23 and 32-33.

However, this table does not show alternate rules. Instead, it shows variable values that were actually used in order to generate the parse shown in FIG. 9 (FIGS. 9A and 9B).

In other words, it shows how the selected nodes of the current parse was formed, not alternate rules.

Loatman et al. only allows a user to inspect the syntactic parse generated from the grammar rules. It allows the user to inspect the particular variables that were used to process an input text, and it also allows the user to see where those variables affected the syntactic parse. However, it does not show any alternate rules that could be applied to any portion of the syntactic parse.

Specifically, the text describing the table "FO933 Variables" in FIG. 9B, which was cited by the Examiner, states "another graphic debugging tool displays and allows interaction with the output of the parse. It is illustrated in FIGS. 9A and 9B...it displays the branches that were taken from each state, beginning with S....One can interact with this parse tree to inspect the results of the parse. In FIG. 9, the user has bugged the bottom Z ↑ node, which holds the parse of the clause 'to block the Iranian actions...'. This has brought up a menu of that clause's registers, case roles..., and other values. The user has bugged the R ↑ instru (instrument) role, and in response [the system] has blinked the noun phrase 'warships stationed in...' to identify it as the filler of that role (i.e., the warships are the instrument of the blocking)." See column 37, lines 7-26 (emphasis added).

It is abundantly clear from this text that the user is simply allowed to inspect the parse using this program. The values in the variable table are those variable values which were used in creating the parse. For instance, when the user bugs one node in the parse tree, and then selects one of the variable values from the table, the program highlights another portion of the parse tree that fills that variable. In the specific example, when the user highlights the node in the parse tree associated with the phrase "to block the Iranian actions...", then the user has highlighted one of the variables in the variable table, and the system blinks the node associated with the noun phrase "warships stationed in..." to indicate that the blinking portion of the parse tree is the portion that fills the variable selected from the table FO933 Variables by the user. In other words, it is clear that the user is asking the system what it used to fill the selected role "selected from the table", and the system blinks a node in the parse tree answering the user, and

indicating that the blinking node is the one the system has used to fill that variable. As specifically stated by Loatman et al., this allows the user to “inspect” the parse tree.

However, as is clearly seen, there is no teaching, suggestion, or even any notion, that table FO933 displays alternate rules, other than those rules that were used to generate a constituent in the parse tree. All the table is doing is showing what variable values were used to generate the selected node of the parse tree, and it is specifically not showing variable values that were not used, much less actual grammar rules that were not applied in generating the constituent for the selected node in the parse tree. Therefore, the only portion of Loatman et al. that the Examiner has pointed to as meeting the “alternate rules” limitation as set out in the present claims simply does not show it. Thus, as has been strenuously argued in prior responses, Loatman et al. does not teach or suggest either of independent claims 1 or 10. Therefore, Applicant submits that independent claims 1 and 10 are allowable over Loatman et al.

Applicant also submits that dependent claims 2-9, 11-17, 20-22 and 32-33, which depend either directly or ultimately from the independent claims, are allowable as well. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of claims 1-17, 20-23, 32 and 33.

The Director is authorized to charge any fee deficiency required by this paper or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 23-1123.

Respectfully submitted,

WESTMAN, CHAMPLIN & KELLY, P.A.

By: /Joseph R. Kelly/
Joseph R. Kelly, Reg. No. 34,847
900 Second Avenue South, Suite 1400
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-3319
Phone: (612) 334-3222 Fax: (612) 334-3312

JRK:slg